

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments are fully supported by the disclosure as originally filed and that no new matter has been introduced. For example, they are supported at least by paragraph 0021.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. 2004/0103282 A1 ("Meier et al.").

Claims 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meier et al. in view of U.S. Pub. 2002/0080741 A1 ("Toyoshima").

These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the subject office action, claims 1-16 were rejected as being anticipated by Meier et al.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include defining an access point (AP) nonce of an AP. Claim 1 also recites that, in response to a probe request, the AP nonce is transmitted by the AP. It is respectfully submitted that Meier et al. do not disclose such features. In contrast, Meier et al. discloses transmitting a key nonce from a subnet context manager to an access point, which forwards the key nonce to the user station (see Figure 8, arrows 17 and 18). Meier et al. do not disclose or suggest defining an AP nonce of an AP, and, in response to a probe request, transmitting, from the AP, the AP nonce in a probe response. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over Meier et al. since Meier et al. fails to teach all of the features of claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 1 and therefore, they are also patentable over Meier et al. for at least the reasons Claim 1 is patentable over Meier et al.

Applicant has amended claim 5 to include defining an access point (AP) nonce of an AP. Claim 5 also recites that the AP nonce is received by a user station in response to a probe request transmitted by the user station. It is respectfully submitted that Meier et al. do not disclose such features. In contrast, as noted above, Meier et al. discloses transmitting a key nonce from a subnet context manager to an access point, which forwards the key nonce to the user station (see Figure 8, arrows 17 and 18). Thus, Meier et al. do not disclose or suggest defining an AP nonce of an AP and receiving, by a user station, the AP nonce from the AP. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 5 is patentable over Meier et al. since Meier et al. fails to teach at least these features of claim 5.

Claims 6-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 5 and therefore, they are also patentable over Meier et al. for at least the reasons Claim 5 is patentable over Meier et al.

Claim 9 is directed to an article of manufacture that comprises a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that, when executed by a computing platform, result in an authenticated key exchange by defining an access point (AP) nonce of an AP and, in response to a probe request, the AP nonce being transmitted by the AP. It is respectfully submitted that Meier et al. do not disclose such features. In contrast, Meier et al. discloses transmitting a key nonce from a subnet context manager to an AP, which forwards the key nonce to the user station (see Figure 8, arrows 17 and 18). Meier et al. do not disclose or suggest defining an AP nonce of an AP and transmitting, by the AP, the AP nonce. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 9 is patentable over Meier et al. since Meier et al. fails to teach at least these features of claim 9.

Claims 10-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 9 and therefore, they are also patentable over Meier et al. for at least the reasons Claim 9 is patentable over Meier et al.

Claim 13 is directed to an article of manufacture that comprises a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that, when executed by a computing platform, result in an authenticated key exchange by an access point (AP) nonce being

received by a user station in response to a probe request transmitted by the user station, wherein the AP nonce is defined as a nonce of the AP. It is respectfully submitted that Meier et al. do not disclose such features. In contrast, as noted above, Meier et al. discloses transmitting a key nonce from a subnet context manager to an access point, which forwards the key nonce to the user station (see Figure 8, arrows 17 and 18). Thus, Meier et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving, by a user station, an AP nonce from an access point, wherein the AP nonce is defined as a nonce of the AP. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over Meier et al. since Meier et al. fails to teach at least these features of claim 13.

Claims 14-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 13 and therefore, they are also patentable over Meier et al. for at least the reasons Claim 13 is patentable over Meier et al.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the subject office action, claims 17-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Meier et al. in view of Toyoshima.

Claim 17 is directed to an apparatus that includes, among other things, a baseband processor to generate a probe request to be transmitted to an access point (AP), and to receive an AP nonce transmitted in response to the probe request, wherein the AP nonce is defined as a nonce of the AP. As discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that Meier et al. do not disclose such features. In contrast, as noted above, Meier et al. discloses transmitting a key nonce from a subnet context manager to an access point, which forwards the key nonce to the user station (see Figure 8, arrows 17 and 18). Thus, Meier et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving, by a baseband processor, an AP nonce from an access point, wherein the AP nonce is defined as a nonce of the AP. It is respectfully submitted that Toyoshima does not make up for the deficiencies of Meier et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 17 is patentable over Meier et al. since Meier et al. and Toyoshima, either alone or in combination, fail to teach at least these features of claim 17.

Claims 18-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, on Claim 17 and therefore, they are also patentable over Meier et al. and Toyoshima for at least the reasons Claim 17 is patentable over Meier et al. and Toyoshima.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit all pending claims, specifically, claims 1-20, are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (503) 796-2997 regarding any inquiry concerning this communication. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: 11/07/2006

/Kevin T. LeMond/
Kevin T. LeMond
Reg. No. 35,933

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981